

Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer

Chair of Systems Design, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

www.sg.ethz.ch

Abstract We study how firms select partners using a large database of publicly announced R&D alliances over a period of 25 years. We identify, for the first time, two distinct behavioral strategies of firms in forming these alliances. By reconstructing and analysing the temporal R&D network of 14,000 international firms and 21.000 publicly announced alliances, we find a “universal” behavior in firms changing between these strategies. In the first strategy, newcomers and nodes of low centrality initially establish links to nodes of *similar or higher* centrality. After these firms have consolidated their position and increased their centrality, they switch to the second strategy, and preferably form links to *less* central nodes. In addition, we show that k -core centrality can be established as a measure of firm’s success that correlates e.g. with the number of patents (obtained from a dataset of 3 Mio patents). To synthesize our findings, we provide a network growth model based on k -core centrality which reproduces the strategic behavior of firms, as well as other properties of the empirical network.

The growth of real networks is often explained by the preferential attachment rule [1], which only assumes that newcomers in a network prefer to connect to the node with the highest degree. This allows to reproduce the power-law distribution of node degrees and the emergence of nodes with profound importance, but it fails to explain saturated growth, or even decline [2], of real networks. In real networks strategic considerations with whom to link govern the growth process [3]. For example, firms searching for partners to form an R&D alliance have to consider complementarities in their knowledge base, but also the network position of their counterparts. This, however, is an important limitation, as it requires full knowledge of the network connections of all counterparts. Hence, in many economic and social networks nodes have to find other ways to improve their position in a competitive environment.

Here, we use the k -core centrality [4] to quantify the importance of nodes in an R&D network, and we show that this measure is highly correlated (more than other widely used centrality measures) with the number of patents filed by the nodes. This way, we link an external –publicly available– source of information to internal properties that are used for link formation. Additionally, we identify two different strategies in choosing partners dependent on the importance of the node itself. These apply either to newcomers or to established nodes. Newcomers, or nodes of little importance, usually establish links to nodes of similar or higher importance, very much like new PhD students team up with fellow students or postdocs in their group, but rarely with famous professors. After these new nodes have established their position and gained considerably in importance, they switch their strategy and preferably establish links to nodes of less importance. In the example at hand, the reputed professor is less likely to restrict his contacts to other professors of similar reputation and more likely to younger graduate students. Likewise, established firms rarely focus their R&D collaboration on other established firms which often have become their competitors. Instead, they are more likely to search for, and to team up with, new start-up companies with fresh ideas.

To empirically verify these two strategies, we analyze the formation of R&D alliances between firms, using a database of 21,572 publicly announced alliances between 14,000 international firms from different economic sectors during 1984 - 2009. In addition, given that the purpose of an R&D collaboration is to create new products, we measure their output by the number of patents filled by every firm, using a database of about three million patents granted in the U.S.A., as described in the *Materials and Methods* section. By representing firms with nodes and alliances with links connecting two nodes, we map the alliance formation process to a growing complex network. Nodes have to choose between the establishment of a new link with another node (alliance with a new partner) and the increase of the weight of an already existing link (alliance with an existing partner). Hence, at every time step the degree of a node represents its mere number of R&D alliances with distinct partners, while the weight of a link between two nodes represents the number of times these two nodes formed an R&D alliance.

1 Empirical Results

The importance of nodes in a network is usually quantified by centrality [5]. In fact, the most central nodes are often shown to be the most influential [6], the most fit [7], or the most (topologically) important [8] ones. Here, we measure centrality based on a recently proposed weighted k -core decomposition method [9]. This method decomposes a network based on the *weighted degree* of the nodes following a pruning procedure described in the “Materials and Methods” section. In a nutshell, we remove all nodes with degree less than k' , until all the remaining nodes have minimum degree $k' + 1$. The removed nodes are labeled with a shell number (k_s) equal to k' , and the shell with the largest k_s value is called *the core* of the network. The closer a node is located to the core, the more central this node is. We define variable called *coreness*, C , which measures the distance between the shell a node belongs to from the core, i.e. the smaller the value of C , the more central – and the more important – the node is.

Of course, the time period for which we construct the network may affect the centrality ranking of nodes (see *SI text*). Hereafter, we will call C_F the coreness ranking obtained using the full time period from 1984 - 2009. In this case, we find that the network is decomposed to 17 k -shells, and the firms that are represented by the nodes of the core (i.e. they have $C_F = 0$) are: *France Telecom*, *Nortel Networks*, *Hitachi*, *Sanyo Electric*, *Microsoft*, *Oki Electric Ind.*, *Philips Electronics*, *Matsushita Electric*, *Nippon Telegraph & Telephone*, *Fujitsu*, *AT&T*, *Mitsubishi Electric*, *Motorola*, *Sony*, *Apple*, *Nec*, *Hewlett Packard*, *Toshiba*, and *IBM*.

With the k -core method we are able to rank nodes according to their centrality, and to group them in shells of similar importance. But, more importantly, the k -core ranking is highly correlated with the number of patents, an external metric which may be used to gauge the output of R&D alliances. More precisely, as discussed in the *SI text*, the Kendall’s pairwise correlation between number of patents and the coreness ranking is $\tau_{CF} = -0.84$ ($p < 0.001$), while for the degree ranking it is $\tau_d = 0.5$ ($p < 0.001$), and for the ranking obtained using betweenness centrality it is $\tau_b = 0.25$ ($p < 0.001$). Note that coreness is negatively correlated with the number of patents, because the smaller C is, the more central the node is. Therefore, we may safely assume that the k -core method provides a better connection –with respect to degree or betweenness centrality– between public information (number of patents) and node centrality, which is an internal topological measure of the network.

Fig. 1A illustrates a growing network where, similar to real R&D networks, nodes create new links either with a new or with an existing partner. As the network grows both in size and density, new k -shells emerge, while the coreness of nodes is updated according to their connectivity patterns. In Fig. 1B we show the real R&D network in the year of 2009, when the core mentioned above has formed (red nodes), and in Fig. 1C we plot the number of nodes in each k -shell versus the coreness C of this shell. A strong core-periphery structure is observed, i.e. the majority of nodes

is located in the periphery, indicated by large C values, while only a small number is topologically close to the core of the network.

The role of individual coreness in the link formation process between two nodes is quantified in Fig. 2. If we exclude nodes that form a link for a very first time, it becomes obvious that existing nodes tend to find partners with similar coreness. This result highlights the existence of degree-degree correlations and is in line with a positive assortativity coefficient [10] which for the case of the R&D network is $r = 0.166$. Similar values, ranging from 0.12 to 0.363 were reported for various collaboration networks, like scientific co-authorship networks [10].

The R&D network grows as new nodes form their first link. From the preferential attachment rule we would expect these new nodes to preferably create links with the already central ones. But, as shown in Fig. 2B this is not the case. By monitoring the link formation process over the whole period we find that even though the core-nodes are involved in most of the total links, only a small fraction of almost 15% are links to previously disconnected nodes, while this fraction is about 25% for nodes with intermediate coreness ($C \in [4, 13]$). Thus, even if new nodes have the preference (and the incentive) to create links with central nodes, in reality they end up linked with other new nodes (i.e. nodes with similar centrality) or with the less central existing ones.

This could result from a selection rule that applies to the central nodes. The already central nodes, in order to further increase their centrality, should establish links with other nodes in their topological neighborhood [11]. However, as nodes become more central, other effects, like capacity constraints, and competition with other central nodes become more important. To demonstrate this, we monitor for both involved nodes the change in coreness that results from the link formation (see *SI text*). For every node we calculate the total number of links it forms every year, its own average coreness value throughout the year C_o , and the average coreness of the nodes it was linked (partner nodes) C_p . These coreness values are normalized with the total number of k -shells in the annual network, in order to obtain C'_o and C'_p that would allow us to compare the centrality of nodes in different years. For every node we can identify a point t_c when it reaches its lowest C'_o value (highest centrality), and we divide the time interval 1984-2009 to two periods, i.e. one before t_c , $[1984, t_c]$ and one after, $(t_c, 2009]$. For each link formed a particular year before t_c , we calculate the weighted mean of the difference $dC' = C'_o - C'_p$, and we repeat the same calculation for the years after t_c , using as weights the fractions of the nodes' annual activity over their total activity. This is done in order to avoid giving the same importance to a dC' calculated for years of low activity with a dC' calculated for years of high activity, which would introduce an unwanted bias in our results. In addition, for both periods we calculate the average $\langle dC' \rangle$ for all nodes with the same coreness score (i.e. nodes at the same k -shell) when considering the final state of the network at the end of 2009 for both periods before and after t_c , and we calculate the difference $\Delta \langle dC' \rangle = \langle dC' \rangle_{\text{before}} - \langle dC' \rangle_{\text{after}}$.

As shown in in Fig. 3 at t_c nodes universally change their alliance formation strategy i.e. they start forming links to nodes with less centrality. This indicates that for more central nodes the competition with other nodes of similar or higher centrality becomes more important than the opportunity to further increase their own centrality through a new link with another central node. This shift in the alliance formation strategy cannot be anticipated based on the assortativity measure. It is also not explained if we assume a limiting choice factor that would force firms with high degrees to randomly choose partners in a uniform way. Therefore, it provides an interesting insight about a previously not explored phase in the link formation process that drives network evolution. But, it is not clear if this shift occurs due to strategic considerations or due to the abundance of choice created by the appearance of newcomers. To address this question, based on our empirical analysis, we model the alliance formation process as follows.

2 Modelling the Alliance Formation

To provide a realistic modeling scenario, we start with a random network of 7 nodes and 11 links, which is equal in size and density to the empirical R&D network of 1984. Since we are interested in the cumulative network, our model network should grow with time. Due to the annual resolution of our data, one modeling timestep represents one calendar year. New nodes and links are added every year, but, we set their number equal to the 1/10 of the number of nodes and links added the same year in the empirical network. This way we create smaller networks that allows for efficient calculations of network properties over many repetitions, while we make sure that the density is always the same as the real network.

Because of their nature, i.e. R&D networks are collaboration networks, isolated nodes cannot exist in the dataset. Thus, at every time step (year) the number of new links is always larger or equal to the number of new nodes. At the beginning of a year we add all new nodes to the network as disconnected components, and afterwards we start adding the links. To make sure that at the end there will be no disconnected nodes left, the disconnected nodes are the first ones to form a link. However, given that the higher the degree of a node the more active the node is in forming alliances, all these initial links follow a preferential attachment (PA) rule. For the remaining links, and in order to respect this degree-activity relation, we select one partner with PA, and a second partner following a selection rule, which for now we will call *rule 1*. To accommodate for the formation of consortia, after a link is established, with probability p we allow the node with the smaller degree to connect to one of the neighboring nodes of its new partner. The selection from the list of the partner's neighboring nodes in this case follows another rule, i.e. *rule 2*.

Using some combinations between rule 1 and rule 2, we tested the performance of three different model variants. The first variant (V_1), assumes that both rule 1 and rule 2 are PA. The second

variant (V_2) assumes that rule 1 is PA and rule 2 is a random selection. Finally, the third variant (V_3) assumes that rule 1 is based on a probability p_c that is related to the coreness of the nodes as $p_c \sim e^{-C}/\sqrt{N_C}$, and rule 2 is again a random selection. The particular non-linear form of the probability distribution p_c is used to make nodes with higher centrality (smaller C values) more appealing for potential partners. Also, because the k -shells have unequal sizes, N_C is the number of nodes in the network with coreness value C , and is used as a correction factor.

In Fig. 4A we plot the degree distribution of three different network ensembles (each one corresponding to one of the above variants), obtained from 100 model realizations, alongside the degree distribution of the full empirical network. As shown in Fig. 4A, all variants reproduce well the empirical degree distribution, which follows a power law with exponent $\gamma = 2.06 \pm 0.02$. The exponent is calculated using the maximum likelihood method (mle) [12] and the power-law hypothesis cannot be rejected with $p = 0.85$. The same holds for all the three variants and for all p values tested, as well (see *SI text*). However, not all model variants perform equally well with respect to other network metrics. For example, V_1 and V_2 result to networks with negative assortativity coefficient, while V_3 provides networks with $r \simeq 0.145$, which is close to the value $r = 0.166$ of the empirical network. As discussed in detail in the *SI text*, and shown in Fig.S11, V_3 constantly outperforms all the rest, and the optimal probability for consortium formation is $p = 0.8$.

In addition, as shown in Fig. 4B, V_3 is even able to reproduce well the coreness distribution of the real data. We should note, however, that for Fig. 4B we used the empirical cumulative R&D network only up to 1990. This is because for this period the empirical network has 967 nodes and 1055 links, and therefore is of a similar size to the model network which in turn consists of 1390 nodes and 1947 links.

Nevertheless, as shown in Fig. 4C, a change in the alliance formation behavior is observed in all our model variants, even though no assumptions about strategic behavior was used. This allows us to conclude that, while the strategic arguments may still be plausible and even play some role, the observed change is due to the abundance of choice in a growing network where newcomers enter at every time step.

3 Discussion

Using k -core centrality to analyze data about the alliance formation of firms, we identified two different strategies for nodes that affect their position in a network. The first strategy, namely to initially link with nodes of similar importance (centrality), helps to get established and to increase in importance. The switch to the second strategy, namely to link with nodes of much less importance, occurs “universally”. This is surprising, since for a node the second strategy

comes with a cost: they not only stop to increase their importance, but even face a decrease. Two possible interpretations for the existence of this shift were tested. A) it could be the outcome of strategic decisions that results from the struggle in a competitive environment, and B) it could just be the result of abundance of choice among newcomers.

To test these hypotheses we modeled the alliance formation process using the coreness of nodes. In addition, as benchmark we used two additional model variants based on the well studied preferential attachment rule.

Our findings show that the coreness-based model is able to reproduce more accurately a wide range of empirical network metrics. However, the shift in alliance formation strategy is observed in all of the model variants. Based on this finding, and considering that all our model variants were minimalistic in their assumptions, we conclude that the shift in alliance behavior is due to the abundance of choice resulting from newcomer nodes.

With our modeling approach we also address two general limitations that apply to all modeling schemes based on topological arguments. The first one is about information available to newcomer nodes. I.e. how realistic is it to assume that a newcomer knows the network position (coreness, degree, etc.) of all other nodes in the network in order to choose a partner accordingly? Here we overcome this limitation using node-specific information about the success of nodes, obtained from a different network. Specifically, this is the number of patents resulting from a patent network that is *public information* to the firms. We demonstrate that this external information strongly correlates with topological information from the original R&D network, i.e. with the coreness. Hence, we can safely assume that a newcomer uses this public information as a proxy for the missing one, namely the topological position of its partner.

The second limitation results from capacity constraints of existing nodes. I.e. how realistic is it to assume that a newcomer node is always accepted by a central node? With the simple preferential attachment rule we end up in a disassortative network, since all newcomers will create links to already central nodes. But the real network is *assortative* because, due to capacity constraints, not all link requests to central nodes can materialize. Thus, nodes choose to create alliances with partners of similar centrality, a behavior that is reproduced as well by our coreness-based growth model. Closing, we conjecture that our findings can be observed in other activities that require collaboration in a growing network in the presence of competition.

4 Materials and Methods

Data

In this work we used two different datasets, one about firm alliance information, and one about firm knowledge production. The firm alliance information is extracted from the Thomson Reuters' *SDC Platinum alliances database*, and the knowledge production is obtained from the National Bureau of Economic Research, *NBER patent database*.

From the SDC database we used a total number of 21,572 alliance reports obtained by all the publicly announced R&D partnerships from 1984 to 2009, for all kinds of economic actors (including firms, investors, banks and universities). We associated every firm with its 4-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code, which enabled us to classify them to the right industrial sector of activity. The R&D network is constructed by linking two firms every time an alliance is announced in the dataset. When an alliance involved more than two firms (*consortium*), all the firms involved were connected in pairs, resulting into a fully connected clique. Multiple links between the same firms are allowed (two firms can have more than one collaboration on different projects), while isolated firms – i.e. firms that had no alliances in a given period – are not part of the network.

Because the SDC database does not provide a unique identifier for each firm, all associations between firm alliances (i.e. the construction of the R&D network) are based on the firm names reported in the dataset. Therefore, we corrected for the cases where two or more entries with different names corresponded to the same firm, by manually controlling for spelling, legal extensions (e.g. LTD, INC, etc.), and any other recurrent key words (e.g. BIO, TECH, PHARMA, LAB, etc.) that could affect the matching between different entries referring to the same company. We decided to keep as separated entities the subsidiaries of the same firm located in different countries.

The NBER patent database contains detailed information on about almost three million patents granted in the U.S.A. between 1974 and 2006. Every patent is associated with one or more assignees and is classified according to the International Patent Classification (IPC) system. In general the NBER database is of very high quality, and allowed us to cross-link the firm names involved in alliance formation events in the SDC database with patent information. From the NBER database we constructed another network of firms where the links represent co-occurrence in the same patent. Thus, the same set of firms participates in a multi-layered network. Here, even though we do not fully exploit this multi-layered structure, we are able to understand the network evolution process in one layer by using information like the degree (number of patents) from the other layer.

k -core decomposition

The k -core decomposition method has its roots to social network analysis [4], and it aims to measure the relative importance of a vertex (node) within the network. In general, the k -core decomposition of a graph is obtained by recursively removing all vertices with degree less than k , and assign to them a shell number k_s equal to k . The shell with the largest k value is called *the core* of the network, and the distance from the core can be seen as a measure of importance of the nodes. Since the method as described above uses only information about the node degree and ignores the existence of link weights, we will call it *unweighted k -core* decomposition, and the distance of a node from the core of the network will be called *unweighted coreness*, C_u .

The unweighted method has been applied successfully in various real-world networks[13, 14], and it received recently much attention due to Kitsak *et al.* who showed that the location of a node in the network's core structure is a more accurate predictor of its spreading potential with respect to its degree k [6]. This is explained because, despite the (expected) strong correlation between the degree and the C_u , there are nodes with high degree that are located in external shells of the network.

The centrality measure used in our study is actually a *weighted coreness*, C_w , calculated from a recently proposed extension of the classic k -core decomposition method. This extension considers in the calculation the weights of the links as well as the degree of the node, and is called *weighted k -core decomposition* [9]. The weighted method applies the same pruning routine used in the unweighted version, but, it uses an alternative measure for the node degree that is called *weighted degree*, k' , which considers both the degree k of a node and the weights of its links. The weighted degree of a node i is defined as

$$k'_i = \left[k_i^\alpha \left(\sum_j^{k_i} w_{ij} \right)^\beta \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}},$$

where k_i is the degree of node i , and $\sum_j^{k_i} w_j$ is the sum over all its link weights [9]. However, in order to simplify the notation, we call this weighted measure “*coreness*”, C .

According to the assumption that a firm with a large number of patents is important from the R&D perspective, throughout this work we used the values $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0.2$ which maximize the correlation between a firm's centrality and its total number of patents (see discussion in the *SI text*). However, we tested the effect of choosing a different parameter set, like $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1$, and it does not significantly alter our conclusions.

References

- [1] Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
- [2] Serguei Saavedra, Felix Reed-Tsochas, and Brian Uzzi. Asymmetric disassembly and robustness in declining networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105(43):16466–16471, 2008.
- [3] Frank Schweitzer, Giorgio Fagiolo, Didier Sornette, Fernando Vega-Redondo, Alessandro Vespignani, and Douglas R. White. Economic networks: the new challenges. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 325(5939):422–425, July 2009.
- [4] Stephen B. Seidman. Network structure and minimum degree. *Social Networks*, 5(3):269–287, September 1983.
- [5] Linton C Freeman. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social Networks*, 1(3):215–239, 1979.
- [6] Maksim Kitsak, Lazaros K. Gallos, Shlomo Havlin, Fredrik Liljeros, Lev Muchnik, H. Eugene Stanley, and Hernán a. Makse. Identification of influential spreaders in complex networks. *Nature Physics*, 6(11):888–893, August 2010.
- [7] Guido Caldarelli, A. Capocci, P. De Los Rios, and Miguel A. Munoz. Scale-Free Networks from Varying Vertex Intrinsic Fitness. *Physical Review Letters*, 89(25):1–4, December 2002.
- [8] Reuven Cohen, Keren Erez, Daniel Ben-Avraham, and Shlomo Havlin. Breakdown of the Internet under Intentional Attack. *Physical Review Letters*, 86(16):3682–3685, April 2001.
- [9] Antonios Garas, Frank Schweitzer, and Shlomo Havlin. A k -shell decomposition method for weighted networks. *New Journal of Physics*, 14(8):083030, August 2012.
- [10] M. E. J. Newman. Assortative mixing in networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 89:208701, Oct 2002.
- [11] Michael D. Koenig and Claudio Juan Tessone. Network Evolution Based on Centrality. *Physical Review E*, 84(5):056108, November 2011.
- [12] Aaron Clauset, Cosma Rohilla Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-Law Distributions in Empirical Data. *SIAM Review*, 51(4):661, 2009.
- [13] Shai Carmi, Shlomo Havlin, Scott Kirkpatrick, Yuval Shavitt, and Eran Shir. A model of Internet topology using k-shell decomposition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104(27):11150–4, July 2007.

- [14] Antonios Garas, Panos Argyrakis, Céline Rozenblat, Marco Tomassini, and Shlomo Havlin. Worldwide spreading of economic crisis. *New Journal of Physics*, 12(11):113043, November 2010.
- [15] Mathieu Bastian, Sebastien Heymann, and Mathieu Jacomy. Gephi: An open source software for exploring and manipulating networks. *International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 2009.
- [16] Stephen P Borgatti and Martin G Everett. Models of core/periphery structures. *Social Networks*, 21(4):375 – 395, 2000.
- [17] Mario V Tomasello, Mauro Napoletano, Antonios Garas, and Frank Schweitzer. The Rise and Fall of R&D Networks. *Arxiv:1304.3623*, April 2013.
- [18] Daniel Ben-Avraham and Shlomo Havlin. *Diffusion and Reactions in Fractals and Disordered Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [19] Phillip Bonacich. Power and centrality: A family of measures. *American journal of sociology*, 92(5):1170–1182, 1987.
- [20] Linton C Freeman. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, 40(1):35–41, 1977.
- [21] Paul W Holland and Samuel Leinhardt. Transitivity in structural models of small groups. *Comparative Group Studies*, 1971.
- [22] Duncan J Watts and Steven H Strogatz. Collective dynamics of "small-world" networks. *nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge financial support from the EU-FET project MULTIPLEX 317532. The calculations of network measures, and the statistical treatment of data were performed using the R software for statistical analysis v2.15.2, and the igraph library v0.6.2.

Author Contributions

A.G. and F.S. designed the research, A.G. performed the research, A.G. and M.V.T. analyzed the empirical data, A.G. and F.S. wrote the manuscript.




Figure 1: Network analysis using the weighted k -shell method. The R&D network has a dynamic structure with new nodes entering and new collaborations occurring over time. (A) Illustration of the network evolution where new k -shells emerge as new links are formed. Note that a node can obtain a lower C value i.e. become more central not only by increasing the number of its collaborations with different nodes, but also by having a large number of collaborations with the same node, especially if this is a more central one. (B) Graphical representation of the cumulative R&D network at the end of 2009. The nodes are colored according to their coreness, and their size is proportional to their degree. This plot is made with Gephi [15] using the OpenOrd layout. (C) The network has a strong core-periphery structure [16], i.e. only a small number of nodes having small C_F values, while the majority of the nodes are located in the periphery and have large C_F values.




Figure 2: Coreness values of partners. (A) C_F values of partner pairs when we consider new nodes that have just entered the network, and when we exclude these new entries. The error bars show the inter-quartile range (IQR). It is easier for a node to create alliances with partner nodes having similar C_F values with its own. Note that the presence of new nodes shifts the plot almost homogeneously towards larger partner C_F values. (B) Histogram of the fraction f_{18} i.e. the number of new entries (nodes that were previously not part of the network, assigned to $k_s = 18$) that partner with nodes having coreness C_F divided with the total number of partners of these nodes. Even though new nodes may have the incentive to find a central partners, this becomes harder as the partner C_F decreases.




Figure 3: Average partner coreness deviation. Plot of the average normalized partner coreness deviation $\langle dC' \rangle$ before and after t_c . The shaded area shows the coreness deviation using a network where we kept the node degree sequence of the empirical network, but we randomly shuffled the alliance links. The observed deviation in the real network is much larger than the one observed in the shuffled network. We performed a two-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to the distributions of the $\Delta \langle dC' \rangle$ for the empirical and the shuffled network, and we can reject that they are the same with $p = 0.056$. Insets: examples of the normalized coreness evolution of firms with different C_F values (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm. With a red vertical line we mark the t_c , to visually clarify the change in collaboration behavior before and after this point. It is interesting to note that the firms are more active during the first phase, when they try to maximize their centrality.




Figure 4: Model results and validation. (A) Degree distribution of the networks obtained using model variant V_1 (orange), V_2 (green), and V_3 (blue), alongside the degree distribution of the full empirical network (circles). (B) Comparison of the coreness distribution obtained from V_3 (blue) versus the distribution of the empirical cumulative network up to 1990 (grey). Inset: Graphical representation of a cumulative model network. The nodes are colored according to their coreness, and their size is proportional to their degree. (C) Plot of the average normalized partner coreness deviation $\langle dC' \rangle$ for the networks obtained using V_1 (orange), V_2 (green), and V_3 (blue). The shaded areas, dashed lines, and error bars in this figure indicate the standard deviation of the average over 100 model realizations.

Supplementary Information
Selection rules in alliance formation:
strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer
Chair of Systems Design, ETH Zurich, Switzerland
www.sg.ethz.ch

Contents

1 Empirical Results	3
2 Modelling the Alliance Formation	5
3 Discussion	6
4 Materials and Methods	8
5 Network analysis	3
6 Analysis of the k-shells	4
7 Correlation between centrality and number of patents	16
8 Normalized coreness evolution	18
9 Model results	24

The Supplementary Information is organized as follows. In Section “*Network analysis*” we discuss about the construction and the properties of the R&D network, and we make a connection with previous works. In Section “*Analysis of the k -shells*” we discuss in detail the results of the weighted and the unweighted k -core decomposition. In Section “*Correlation between centrality and number of patents*” we study how the results of the weighted k -core method are related to other centrality measures, and how centrality is correlated with the “success” of a firm. In Section “*Normalized coreness evolution*” we discuss about the evolution of our measure of centrality, where we give details about the methodology followed for the annual coreness analysis, and we provide results about different firms supporting the conclusions of our manuscript. Closing, in

Section “*Model results*” we provide results from our model’s different variants, and we discuss their performance in reproducing properties of the empirical network.

5 Network analysis

In a recent work Tomasello et al. [17] performed a detailed analysis of the structural properties and the evolution of the full empirical R&D network and its main sectoral sub-networks. Repeating such a detailed analysis is out of the scope of our current work, however, we will highlight some properties of the network evolution that we feel are essential to provide the reader with a more detailed view of the system.

In general, the R&D network is characterized by a pronounced *cyclic evolution*. In Fig. S1a we plot the networks created by alliance formation in three different years, while in Fig. S1b we show three snapshots of the cumulative network for the same years. It is clear that the annual network of 1994 is bigger (larger number of nodes) and more connected (larger number of links) than the other two. The full evolution of all the annual networks is shown in Fig. S1c, where the cyclic evolution of the network, with its growth and decline becomes clear.

Additionally, given that through alliance formations knowledge from one firm may be transferred to another, it is interesting to study the overall connectivity of the cumulative network, as it is the one that contains the full history of alliance formation. More precisely, it is interesting to study how the cluster size distribution of the cumulative network evolves.

Using an approach from percolation theory [18], the average cluster size of the network is calculated by

$$I_{av} = \sum_{m=1}^{m_{\max}} \frac{i_m m^2}{N^2}, \quad (1)$$

where m is the size of clusters and i_m is the number of clusters of size m . Accordingly we calculate the reduced average cluster size I'_{av} , that is the average cluster size without the largest cluster

$$I'_{av} = \sum_{m=1}^{m_{\max}} \frac{i_m m^2}{N^2} - \frac{m_{\max}^2}{N^2}. \quad (2)$$

The evolution of I_{av} and I'_{av} is shown in Fig. S1d. At the early years the network is fragmented to many isolated - in general small - clusters, but from a very early stage a larger cluster emerges. Eventually, right after 1989 - 1990 the size of the largest cluster diverges very fast and after 1992 - 1993 it dominates the network. This domination of the largest cluster means that knowledge can diffuse in the network more effectively in the later years, with profound effects on firm productivity.




Figure S1: Evolution of the R&D network. (A) Three snapshots of annual networks. (B) Three snapshots of the cumulative networks. (C) Evolution of the size of the network, and the size of its largest connected component (largest cluster). (D) Evolution of the average cluster size (I_{av}), and the reduced average cluster size (I'_{av}).

6 Analysis of the k -shells

We applied both, the unweighted and weighted, k -core decomposition methods to the cumulative network spanning the whole time period from 1985 to 2009. Initially, for the weighted method we used $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Since both methods provide us with ranked ordered lists, we compared their outcomes using the Kendall's τ correlation coefficient. In general, we find that this correlation is very high $\tau = 0.998 \pm 0.001$, $p < 10^{-15}$. However, since we are studying the cumulative network

Weighted k -core	Unweighted k -core
Nippon Telegraph & Telephone	XSoft
Sharp	SoftQuad
Sanyo Electric	Open Text
OKI Electric Ind.	OfficeSmith CTMG
Apple	Information Design
Motorola	Furlcrum
Matsushita Electric	EBT
AT&T	Database Publishing Sys.
Intel	Avalanche Dev.
Microsoft	Arbortext
Int. Business Machines	Aiscorp
Hewlett Packard	Broadvision
Sony	Information Dimensions
Mitsubishi Electric	Intergraph
Fujitsu	Object Design
NEC	Computer Task
Hitachi	Oracle Sys.
Toshiba	

Table S1: Firms identified as the core of the R&D network using the weighed k -core decomposition method with $\alpha = \beta = 1$, and the unweighted k -core decomposition method.

where the weights of the links represent the actual number of collaborations between two firms, we would expect the weighted method to provide with more accurate ranking. Our expectation is supported by Table S1, where we list the names of the firms located in the core as identified by both methods.

As shown in Table S1 the list of firms that were assigned in the core by both methods are totally different. However, the list that is provided by the weighted method matches better with our intuition as it contains very big and well known firms. With such a big difference in the ranking of the most central firms it is somehow surprising that we find so strong correlation in the ranking results of both methods. The picture changes if we repeat this procedure by focusing only in the 100 firms that were identified as more central by both methods. In this case, the correlation coefficient becomes $\tau = 0.54 \pm 0.05$, $p < 10^{-10}$. Thus, we conclude that the ranking of both methods is somehow correlated, but, the strong correlation is mostly due to the large number of firms that are placed in the periphery of the network by both measures.

It is interesting to test how correlated are the rankings of nodes provided by the weighted k -core method with the rankings according to other (widely used) centrality measures, like *degree centrality*, *eigenvector centrality* [19], and *betweenness centrality* [20]. As shown in Table S2, the ranking of the weighted k -core decomposition is highly correlated with the degree centrality of the nodes. This is somehow expected, as the degree of a node is an important ingredient of the method. However, this correlation is not perfect since, in-line with our previous discussion, there could be nodes with high degree that do not belong to the more central parts of the networks. The correlation with the other measures is much lower, highlighting that different centrality

	weighted k -core	degree	eigenvector	betweenness
weighted k-core	1			
degree	0.86	1		
eigenvector	0.39	0.39	1	
betweenness	0.55	0.75	0.37	1

Table S2: Kendall's τ correlation coefficient between the scores of different measures. For the weighted k -core we used $\alpha = \beta = 1$. The significance level is $p < 10^{-15}$.

measures capture different properties of the nodes.

Next, we will discuss the effect of the aggregation used to get the cumulative network on the results we get from the weighted k -core method. First, we will look into which firms form the core of the network when we only consider the annual networks. It is interesting to find out whether the firms we identified to be the most central in the cumulative network became central because they appear frequently (or even always) in the core of annual networks.

Core: 1984	Core: 1985	Core: 1986
UNIV AMSTERDAM TOUCHE ROSS LLOYDS LONDON INT BUSINESS MACHINES CAP GEMINI INNOVATION	SAKAI CHEM IND MITSUBISHI PETROCHEMICAL MITSUBISHI HEAVY IND FELDMUEHLE GRACE NOXERAM	MITSUBISHI HEAVY IND KAWASAKI HEAVY IND JAPAN AIRCRAFT DEV BOEING
Core: 1987	Core: 1988	Core: 1989
SOFTLAB SIEMENS ICL INT BUSINESS MACHINES CAP GEMINI INNOVATION	ROYAL BANK SCOTTISH KREDIETBANK FIRST FIDELITY BANCORP NJ ELECTRONIC DATA SYS CREDIT COMML FRANCE BANCO SANTANDER BANCO COMERCIO E IND	UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS GEN MOTORS FORD MOTOR CHRYSLER
Core: 1990	Core: 1991	Core: 1992
UNDISCLOSED ITAL PARTNERS UNDISCLOSED FRENCH RADIO PUBLIC MIMETICS COLLEGE LONDON TEST ANIMAL CENT NIPPON KREA KYOWA HAKKO KOGYO CHUGAI PHARM SANKYO YAMANOUCHI PHARM SONY SOFTBANK NOVELL FUJITSU CANON HOECHST NEC TOSHIBA UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS THOMSON	TULLETT & TOKYO FOREX TOKYO FOREX TELERATE SUMITOMO BANK SANWA BANK SAKURA BANK MITSUBISHI TRUST & BANK MITSUBISHI BANK MINEX KOBAYASHI FUJI BANK DAI ICHI KANGYO BANK BANK TOKYO KDD IND BANK JAPAN	RICOH CSK CANON IBM JAPAN OKI ELECTRIC IND UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer:
Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Core: 1993	Core: 1994	Core: 1995
XSOFT SOFTQUAD ORACLE SYS OPEN TEXT OFFICESMITH CTMG OBJECT DESIGN BROADVISION INTERGRAPH INFORMATION DIMENSIONS INFORMATION DESIGN FULCRUM EBT DATABASE PUBLISHING SYS COMPUTER TASK AVALANCHE DEV ARBORTEXT AISCORP	SANYO ELECTRIC NORTEL NETWORKS MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC FRANCE TELECOM CABLE & WIRELESS PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE AT & T SONY OKI ELECTRIC IND MOTOROLA APPLE TOSHIBA MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC	UNISYS SCI MUSEUM MINNESOTA OREGON MUSEUM SCI MUSEUM SCI MIAMI MUSEUM SCI FRANKLIN INST SCI EXPLORATORIUM FRANCE TELECOM DETEMOBIL NOVELL AT & T INTEL INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD
Core: 1996	Core: 1997	Core: 1998
WESTERN DIGITAL UNISYS TEXAS INSTR SEAGATE SOFTWARE QUANTUM QLOGIC MTI TECH MOTOROLA DEC BUSLOGIC ADAPTEC SUN MICROSYSTEMS INTEL NAT SEMICONDUCTOR HEWLETT PACKARD	TEXAS INSTR PACKARD BELL ELECTRONICS MIDWEST MICRO MICRON ELECTRONICS GATEWAY DURACOM COMPUTER SYS DELL HEWLETT PACKARD MICROSOFT	UNDISCLOSED TAIWAN MNFG TANG ENG IRON WORKS LIO HO MACHINE WORKS CHUNGSHAN INST SCI CHINA STEEL AEROSPACE IND DEV
Core: 1999	Core: 2000	Core: 2001
YOSHITOMI PHARM INDS TANABE SEIYAKU TAKEDA PHARM SUMITOMO PHARM SHIONOGI ONO PHARM FUJISAWA PHARM DAINIPPON PHARM	ROHM OKI ELECTRIC IND SONY SANYO ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC SHARP NEC TOSHIBA HITACHI FUJITSU	UNIV TEXAS AT DALLAS UNIV TECH UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS SARNOFF IMEC HEINRICH HERTZ INST CENT RES ALCATEL LUCENT
Core: 2002	Core: 2003	Core: 2004
TOKYO STOCK EXCHANGE TAIWAN STOCK EXCHANGE STOCK EXCHANGE THAILAND SINGAPORE EXCHANGE SHENZHEN STOCK EXCHANGE SHANGHAI STOCK EXCHANGE PHILIPPINE STOCK EXCHANGE KUALA LUMPUR STOCK EXCHANGE KOREA STOCK EXCHANGE JAKARTA STOCK EXCHANGE HKEX	ZHANG WEN BO SIOC SHANGHAI INS BIOLOGICAL SHANGHAI FUDAN ZHANGJIANG PEI GANG MA WEI	TU SHENZHEN SUN SHENZHEN SHENZHEN KAIFA TECH PAYTON TECH QIAO XING MOBILE COMMUNICATION HUIZHOU QIAO XING COMMUNICATION GALBO ENTERPRISES CELBON YOSEF YARDEN TARGETED MOLECULAR DIAGNOSTICS ELI ROSENBAUM DAVID SIDRANSKY SYNERGENICS SYNCO BIO PARTNERS DSM BIOLOGICAL CRUCCELL

Core: 2005	Core: 2006	Core: 2007
TIANJIN SHI YI YAO TIANJIN SHI HE XI QU BEI FANG TIANJIN GUO JIN INVESTMENT BEADLE UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS POWERTECH TECH KINGSTON TECH JAPAN ELPIDA MEMORY TECHPOOL BIO PHARMA SHANGHAI UNITED GUANGZHOU TECH VENTURE CAPITAL GUANGZHOU BOPU BIO TECH STMICROELECTRONICS PHILIPS SEMICONDUCTORS FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR BRION TECH NUVERA FUEL CELLS FIAT POWERTRAIN TECH FIAT	YAMAHA MOTOR TAIWAN TA YIH IND HUA CHUANG AUTO INFO. TECH EVERLIGHT ELECTRONICS EPISTAR DEPO AUTO PARTS IND ARTC	SONY ERICSSON MOBILE COM. SHARP RENESAS TECH NTT DOCOMO MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU
Core: 2008	Core: 2009	
UOP JETBLUE AIRWAYS INT AERO ENGINES HONEYWELL AEROSPACE AIRBUS	UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS JR SCI BIO BRIDGE SCI	

As shown in the above list of tables, the core of the alliance networks that are created every year fluctuates heavily in terms of number as well as in terms of components. In addition, the presence of a company in the core of the alliance network a particular year is not enough to guarantee a presence in the cumulative core. Thus, securing a central part in the cumulative network is a result of a *career path* that requires long term strategic alliance formation.

Given that our weighted k -core results are based on the cumulative network, the time window used to aggregate the firm alliance activities may affect the outcome of the method. Here we discuss in detail about the existence of such aggregation effect, focusing - only - on the core firms identified by the weighted k -core method when different cumulative networks are considered. As a reference we will use the core obtained from the cumulative network aggregating the activity from 1984 to 2009. The coreness ranking obtained using this network will be called C_F , therefore, the reference core will consist of all firms with $C_F = 0$.

In order to quantify the similarities between the cores of different networks, we calculate the fraction

$$|\text{core}_{\text{ref}} \cap \text{core}_c| / |\text{core}_{\text{ref}}|,$$

where core_{ref} is the reference core, core_c is the core calculated with the current aggregation time window, and $|\dots|$ is an operator returning the number of unique elements in a set.

To be more precise, two different schemes of aggregation that result to different cumulative networks are considered. In the first approach, we fix the starting point to 1984, i.e. the first year we have available data, and we vary the ending point of the aggregation period. In the second approach, we fix the ending point to 2009, i.e. the last year we have available data, and




Figure S2: Illustration of the aggregation periods. Different time windows ($\longleftrightarrow$) are used to calculate the aggregated networks prior applying the $W_{k\text{-shell}}$ method. In the figure we also show the similarity between the core obtained using different aggregation periods and the core obtained using the full period from 1984-2009. The upper part of the figure shows the variable end point aggregation, always starting from 1984, while the lower part of the figure shows the variable starting point aggregation, always ending at 2009.

we vary the starting point of the aggregation period. In Fig. S2 is shown a schematic illustration of the different aggregation methods, together with the similarity measures between the cores of different sub-periods with the reference core of the full period.

In Fig. S3 we plot the network size for the different aggregation time windows used. The shaded area highlights the range where the core we find is the same with the reference core. In general, for both methods, the same core appears when the network is big enough to include the largest part of the alliances formed. It is interesting to note that this - stable - reference core emerges when we approach the period 1994 - 2000, that is the period when the collaboration activity reached its maximum for all economic sectors.

In general, someone may argue that the observed core could be an artifact of the data, but even if this is the case, this does not affect the main finding of our manuscript, i.e. a universal shift in the collaboration activity of firms when they reach their own minimum coreness value (reach their most central position).




Figure S3: Size of the network for different aggregation time windows. Top: Size of the aggregated network for different time windows always starting at 1984 with variable ending point. Bottom: Size of the aggregated network for different time windows with variable starting point always ending at 2009.

To conclude this discussion, in the following tables we report the names of the core companies obtained by the weighted k -core method applied in networks aggregated using different time windows as shown in Fig. S2.

Core: 1984 - 1984	Core: 1984 - 1985	Core: 1984 - 1986
UNIV AMSTERDAM TOUCHE ROSS LLOYDS LONDON INT BUSINESS MACHINES CAP GEMINI INNOVATION	UNIV AMSTERDAM TOUCHE ROSS LLOYDS LONDON INT BUSINESS MACHINES CAP GEMINI INNOVATION	UNIV AMSTERDAM TOUCHE ROSS LLOYDS LONDON INT BUSINESS MACHINES CAP GEMINI INNOVATION
Core: 1984 - 1987	Core: 1984 - 1988	Core: 1984 - 1989
SOFTLAB ICL SIEMENS UNIV AMSTERDAM TOUCHE ROSS LLOYDS LONDON INT BUSINESS MACHINES CAP GEMINI INNOVATION	ROYAL BANK SCOTTISH KREDIETBANK FIRST FIDELITY BANCORP NJ ELECTRONIC DATA SYS CREDIT COMML FRANCE BANCO SANTANDER BANCO COMERCIO E IND	ROYAL BANK SCOTTISH KREDIETBANK FIRST FIDELITY BANCORP NJ ELECTRONIC DATA SYS CREDIT COMML FRANCE BANCO SANTANDER BANCO COMERCIO E IND

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer:
Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Core: 1984 - 1990	Core: 1984 - 1991	Core: 1984 - 1992
ROYAL BANK SCOTTISH KREDIETBANK FIRST FIDELITY BANCORP NJ ELECTRONIC DATA SYS CREDIT COMML FRANCE BANCO SANTANDER BANCO COMERCIO E IND UNDISCLOSED ITAL PARTNERS RADIO PUBLIC MIMETICS COLLEGE LONDON UNDISCLOSED FRENCH SOFTBANK FUJITSU NOVELL NEC SONY TOSHIBA CANON TEST ANIMAL CENT NIPPON KREA HOECHST CHUGAI PHARM SANKYO KYOWA HAKKO KOGYO YAMANOUCHI PHARM THOMSON UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS	TULLETT & TOKYO FOREX TOKYO FOREX TELERATE SUMITOMO BANK SANWA BANK SAKURA BANK MITSUBISHI TRUST & BANK MITSUBISHI BANK MINEX KOBAYASHI FUJI BANK DAI ICHI KANGYO BANK BANK TOKYO IND BANK JAPAN KDD	TULLETT & TOKYO FOREX TOKYO FOREX TELERATE SUMITOMO BANK SANWA BANK SAKURA BANK MITSUBISHI TRUST & BANK MITSUBISHI BANK MINEX KOBAYASHI FUJI BANK BANK TOKYO DAI ICHI KANGYO BANK IND BANK JAPAN KDD
Core: 1984 - 1993	Core: 1984 - 1994	Core: 1984 - 1995
XSOFT SOFTQUAD OPEN TEXT OFFICESMITH CTMG INFORMATION DIMENSIONS INFORMATION DESIGN FULCRUM EBT DATABASE PUBLISHING SYS AVALANCHE DEV ARBORTEXT AISCORP BROADVISION INTERGRAPH OBJECT DESIGN COMPUTER TASK ORACLE SYS	OKI ELECTRIC IND FRANCE TELECOM MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC HITACHI NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NORTEL NETWORKS NEC TOSHIBA NOVELL AT & T INTEL MOTOROLA MICROSOFT APPLE HEWLETT PACKARD INT BUSINESS MACHINES	OKI ELECTRIC IND MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC HITACHI NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE FRANCE TELECOM MITSUBISHI ELEC PHILIPS ELECTRONICS FUJITSU NORTEL NETWORKS SONY NEC TOSHIBA MOTOROLA APPLE AT & T NOVELL MICROSOFT INTEL HEWLETT PACKARD INT BUSINESS MACHINES

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer:
Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Core: 1984 - 1996	Core: 1984 - 1997	Core: 1984 - 1998
NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE OKI ELECTRIC IND PHILIPS ELECTRONICS FRANCE TELECOM MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC NORTEL NETWORKS HITACHI MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU SONY NEC TOSHIBA APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T NOVELL MICROSOFT INTEL INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD	OKI ELECTRIC IND FRANCE TELECOM PHILIPS ELECTRONICS MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC NORTEL NETWORKS NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE HITACHI MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC TOSHIBA APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T NOVELL INTEL INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD MICROSOFT	OKI ELECTRIC IND FRANCE TELECOM PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTEL NETWORKS NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC HITACHI FUJITSU SONY NEC TOSHIBA AT & T APPLE MOTOROLA NOVELL INT BUSINESS MACHINES INTEL HEWLETT PACKARD MICROSOFT
Core: 1984 - 1999	Core: 1984 - 2000	Core: 1984 - 2001
OKI ELECTRIC IND FRANCE TELECOM PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTEL NETWORKS NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC HITACHI FUJITSU SONY NEC TOSHIBA AT & T APPLE MOTOROLA NOVELL INT BUSINESS MACHINES INTEL HEWLETT PACKARD MICROSOFT	SANYO ELECTRIC NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE INTEL OKI ELECTRIC IND MOTOROLA APPLE AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INT BUSINESS MACHINES MICROSOFT HEWLETT PACKARD MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY HITACHI FUJITSU NEC TOSHIBA	SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE INTEL SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND MOTOROLA APPLE AT & T INT BUSINESS MACHINES MICROSOFT HEWLETT PACKARD MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA
Core: 1984 - 2002	Core: 1984 - 2003	Core: 1984 - 2004
SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE INTEL SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND MOTOROLA APPLE AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND INTEL APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND INTEL APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer:
Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Core: 1984 - 2005	Core: 1984 - 2006	Core: 1984 - 2007
SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND INTEL APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND INTEL APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD MITSUBISHI ELEC SONY FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP INTEL SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND MOTOROLA APPLE AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA
Core: 1984 - 2008	Core: 1984 - 2009	
NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC AT & T INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC AT & T INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	
Core: 1985 - 2009	Core: 1986 - 2009	Core: 1987 - 2009
NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC AT & T INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC AT & T INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC AT & T INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU NEC HITACHI TOSHIBA

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer:
Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Core: 1988 - 2009	Core: 1989 - 2009	Core: 1990 - 2009
NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INTEL AT & T MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC AT & T INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INTEL AT & T MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC HITACHI TOSHIBA NEC FUJITSU
Core: 1991 - 2009	Core: 1992 - 2009	Core: 1993 - 2009
SHARP NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI FUJITSU	SHARP SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND APPLE MOTOROLA AT & T MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INTEL MICROSOFT INT BUSINESS MACHINES HEWLETT PACKARD SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC HITACHI FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC	NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE INTEL MICROSOFT APPLE MOTOROLA HEWLETT PACKARD INT BUSINESS MACHINES AT & T SANYO ELECTRIC SHARP OKI ELECTRIC IND SONY MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC HITACHI FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC
Core: 1994 - 2009	Core: 1995 - 2009	Core: 1996 - 2009
PHILIPS ELECTRONICS INTEL NIPPON TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE MICROSOFT HEWLETT PACKARD MOTOROLA APPLE INT BUSINESS MACHINES AT & T SANYO ELECTRIC SHARP OKI ELECTRIC IND SONY MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI FUJITSU	SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND SHARP SONY MITSUBISHI ELEC MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI FUJITSU	SANYO ELECTRIC OKI ELECTRIC IND SHARP SONY MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI FUJITSU

Antonios Garas, Mario V. Tomasello, and Frank Schweitzer:
Selection rules in alliance formation: strategic decisions or abundance of choice?

Core: 1997 - 2009	Core: 1998 - 2009	Core: 1999 - 2009
OKI ELECTRIC IND ROHM SANYO ELECTRIC SONY SHARP MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI	OKI ELECTRIC IND ROHM SANYO ELECTRIC SONY SHARP MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI	ROHM OKI ELECTRIC IND SONY SANYO ELECTRIC SHARP MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI
Core: 2000 - 2009	Core: 2001 - 2009	Core: 2002 - 2009
ROHM OKI ELECTRIC IND SONY SANYO ELECTRIC SHARP MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU TOSHIBA NEC HITACHI	TOKYO STOCK EXCHANGE TAIWAN STOCK EXCHANGE STOCK EXCHANGE THAILAND SINGAPORE EXCHANGE SHENZHEN STOCK EXCHANGE SHANGHAI STOCK EXCHANGE PHILIPPINE STOCK EXCHANGE KUALA LUMPUR STOCK EXCHANGE KOREA STOCK EXCHANGE JAKARTA STOCK EXCHANGE HKEX	TOKYO STOCK EXCHANGE TAIWAN STOCK EXCHANGE STOCK EXCHANGE THAILAND SINGAPORE EXCHANGE SHENZHEN STOCK EXCHANGE SHANGHAI STOCK EXCHANGE PHILIPPINE STOCK EXCHANGE KUALA LUMPUR STOCK EXCHANGE KOREA STOCK EXCHANGE JAKARTA STOCK EXCHANGE HKEX
Core: 2003 - 2009	Core: 2004 - 2009	Core: 2005 - 2009
YAMAHA MOTOR TAIWAN TA YIH IND HUA CHUANG AUTO INFO. TECH EVERLIGHT ELECTRONICS EPISTAR DEPO AUTO PARTS IND ARTC	YAMAHA MOTOR TAIWAN TA YIH IND HUA CHUANG AUTO INFO. TECH EVERLIGHT ELECTRONICS EPISTAR DEPO AUTO PARTS IND ARTC	YAMAHA MOTOR TAIWAN TA YIH IND HUA CHUANG AUTO INFO. TECH EVERLIGHT ELECTRONICS EPISTAR DEPO AUTO PARTS IND ARTC
Core: 2006 - 2009	Core: 2007 - 2009	Core: 2008 - 2009
YAMAHA MOTOR TAIWAN TA YIH IND HUA CHUANG AUTO INFO. TECH EVERLIGHT ELECTRONICS EPISTAR DEPO AUTO PARTS IND ARTC	SONY ERICSSON MOBILE COM. SHARP RENESAS TECH NTT DOCOMO MITSUBISHI ELEC FUJITSU	UOP JETBLUE AIRWAYS INT AERO ENGINES HONEYWELL AEROSPACE AIRBUS
Core: 2009 - 2009		
UNDISCLOSED JV PARTNERS JR SCI BIO BRIDGE SCI		

7 Correlation between centrality and number of patents

Here we use information from the NBER patent database to identify whether there is any correlation between the ranking of firms based on the different centrality measures considered above, and their number of patents. In order to do so, we divided the firms in classes according to their centrality scores and we calculated the average number of patents of every class. For example if we assume that there are 100 firms with degree $k = 30$, we put them all in the class number 30, and we assigned to this class as patent number the average number of patents of these 100 firms. By repeating this procedure for all centrality measures, we find that the Kendall's correlation coefficient between the degree and number of patents is $\tau = 0.5$, $p < 10^{-12}$. In the same way, the correlation coefficient between betweenness centrality and number of patents is $\tau = 0.25$, $p < 10^{-15}$, and the correlation between the *coreness*, C_F - as provided by the weighted k -core decomposition method - and the number of patents is $\tau = -0.493$, $p < 0.001$. Here we should remind the reader that the lower the coreness value is the closer the firm is to the core (or the more central the firm is), which explains the negative sign in the correlation coefficient.

At a first glance it seems that the ranking according to the degree, and the ranking according to the weighted coreness (using $\alpha = \beta = 1$) is equally correlated with the number of patents. But, the weighted k -core method allows to tune the parameters α and β according to how much "weight" we want to assign to the weights and to the degree. So, it is interesting to test if there are different values of the parameters α and β that would give a higher correlation coefficient than $\tau = -0.493$. To test this, we calculated the correlation coefficient between the number of patents and the weighted coreness for all values of the pair $(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ using a step of $\Delta\alpha = \Delta\beta = 0.1$. The results are shown in Table 3. From this Table we find different values of the parameters α and β that lead to stronger correlation between C_F and the number of patents, but, the strongest value $\tau = -0.84$ is obtained for $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0.2$. This pair of values is used in the analysis presented in the manuscript, but we obtain almost identical results using $\alpha = \beta = 1$, as well.

Here we would like to highlight that the upper triangular matrix is the region where $\alpha < \beta$, which means that the results of the weighted k -core method are affected more by the link weights and less on the degree (weight-dominated region). Accordingly, the lower triangular matrix is the region where $\alpha > \beta$, which means that the results of the weighted k -core method are affected more by the node degrees and less on the link weights (degree-dominated region). The average correlation in the weight-dominated region is $\langle \tau \rangle = -0.52 \pm 0.04$, while the average correlation on the degree-dominated region is $\langle \tau \rangle = -0.70 \pm 0.08$. From this observation we conclude that, while the weights (i.e. path dependence in alliance formation) play, indeed, role in how central

		β									
		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.0
α	0.1	-0.493	-0.544	-0.516	-0.542	-0.512	-0.487	-0.487	-0.487	-0.536	-0.570
	0.2	-0.779	-0.493	-0.463	-0.543	-0.480	-0.516	-0.516	-0.542	-0.453	-0.512
	0.3	-0.778	-0.663	-0.493	-0.593	-0.528	-0.543	-0.565	-0.473	-0.516	-0.533
	0.4	-0.556	-0.779	-0.695	-0.493	-0.636	-0.462	-0.486	-0.543	-0.467	-0.480
	0.5	-0.843	-0.765	-0.663	-0.610	-0.493	-0.549	-0.526	-0.523	-0.478	-0.543
	0.6	-0.838	-0.778	-0.779	-0.663	-0.619	-0.493	-0.518	-0.593	-0.462	-0.522
	0.7	-0.823	-0.634	-0.602	-0.716	-0.695	-0.636	-0.493	-0.567	-0.565	-0.534
	0.8	-0.824	-0.556	-0.637	-0.779	-0.663	-0.695	-0.636	-0.493	-0.567	-0.636
	0.9	-0.783	-0.595	-0.778	-0.614	-0.716	-0.663	-0.619	-0.636	-0.493	-0.576
	1.0	-0.783	-0.843	-0.634	-0.765	-0.779	-0.663	-0.684	-0.610	-0.636	-0.493

Table S3: Correlation between the number of patents and the ranking of companies provided by the weighted coreness, C_F , for different values of the parameter α (rows) and β (columns). The correlation strength is expressed using Kendall's τ , and the significance level is $p < 0.001$.

a firm can become, the degree (i.e. the total number of distinct partners) is the most important component to explain the process that increase a firm's centrality.

Closing this section, we would like to discuss about the correlation between the coreness values obtained by the weighted k -core method using $\alpha = \beta = 1$, and the coreness values obtained using $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0.2$. In this case we find that $\tau = 0.998$ $p < 10^{-15}$, but once more this strong correlation is explained from the large number of firms located in the periphery of the network. If we use only the 100 most central firms, we find that the correlation coefficient is $\tau = 0.818$ $p < 10^{-15}$.

8 Normalized coreness evolution

The procedure followed in order to measure the coreness evolution of all the firms in our dataset can be summarized as follows. First during the network evolution we calculate the coreness of every pair of firms engaged in an alliance. This way we have the coreness information before, C^b , and after, C^a , an alliance is formed. If one or both firms were not part of the network before this alliance event, we set C^b equal to some artificial number, which is chosen as $k_s^{\max} + 1$, in order to be able to differentiate the newcomers whenever needed. Next, we use the ranking of firms obtained by the weighted k -core decomposition with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0.2$ on the cumulative network over the full period from 1984 - 2009, C_F , and for every firm belonging to a specific k -shell we follow steps 1 to 6:

1. We divide the whole period into 26 annual periods from 1984 - 2009.
2. For every year we select all alliances involving the firm in question.
3. We find all the alliance partners.
4. We compute the mean coreness value $\langle C \rangle$ over all alliances events in that year (meaning that we calculate the average coreness of the focal firm, and the average coreness of its partners).
5. We normalize these coreness values by the total number of k -shells that are present in the network after each event. Thus, we obtain a normalized coreness, $\langle C' \rangle$, which belongs to the interval $[0,1]$. Knowing $\langle C' \rangle$ allows to compare coreness values for different time periods when in general the network has different numbers of k -shells.
6. We normalize the number of alliances the particular firm was engaged this year with the total number of alliances of this firm over the whole period. This way for every year we obtain the fraction of the overall collaboration activity of the particular firm.

The detailed coreness evolution of firms from different k -shells is shown in the following plots:




Figure S4: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 0$ – core firms – (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.




Figure S5: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 1$ (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.




Figure S6: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 2$ (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.




Figure S7: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 3$ (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.




Figure S8: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 6$ (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.




Figure S9: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 7$ (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.




Figure S10: Normalized coreness evolution of firms with $C_F = 11$ (blue circles), and the average normalized coreness evolution of their partners (open circles). The size of the open circle is proportional to the fraction of collaborations involving the particular firm happened in a given year over the total number of collaborations of this firm.

9 Model results

As discussed in the main text, three different variants of a network growth model were used for our analysis. Here we discuss how these variants perform in reproducing properties observed in the empirical network.

We start from the degree distribution, for which the power-law hypothesis – with exponent $\gamma \simeq 2$ – cannot be rejected for the empirical network. As discussed in the main text (and shown in Fig. 4A), all model variants reproduce well the empirical degree distribution. To provide more quantitative arguments, for all three variants we tested the power law hypothesis and calculated the power-law exponent γ using different parameters p for consortium formation. In our tests and exponent calculations we used the maximum likelihood method suggested by Clauset et al. [12]. Our results show that the power law hypothesis cannot be rejected for all the three model variants. More precisely, for V_1 the minimum p-value is $p = 0.9499$, and was obtained for probability $p = 0.9$, for V_2 a minimum p-value of $p = 0.8778$ is obtained for $p = 0.9$ as well, while for V_3 the minimum p-value of $p = 0.5784$ is obtained for $p = 0.2$. The power law exponents are shown in Fig. S11, and are close to the empirical value for all three variants.

In addition to the degree distribution, we studied how our models reproduce other properties of the network, like the assortativity, r , and the clustering coefficient, cl [21, 22]. V_1 , which is based only on the PA rule, yields disassortative networks. Their assortativity coefficient monotonically increase with the probability p , from $r = -0.1446$ for $p = 0$, to $r = -0.103$ for $p = 1$. These values are very different from what we observe in the empirical network. In this case, the network is assortative with $r = 0.166$. Similar results we obtain from V_2 , which produces disassortative network, with assortativity coefficient close to zero (Fig. S11). Contrary to V_1 and V_2 , the third variant, V_3 , yields indeed assortative networks with $r \simeq 1.45$, which is very close to the empirical value.

Testing how these variants perform in reproducing the clustering coefficient, as shown in Fig. S11, once again we find that V_3 performs best. In a collaboration network the clustering coefficient is an important measure, as it shows how densely nodes collaborate with neighbors of their collaborators. Therefore, since the clustering coefficient obtained from V_3 for $p = 0.8$ co-insides with the empirical one, we decided to use $p = 0.8$ as the reference point for V_3 . In the same line, we used $p = 0.1$ reference point for V_1 and V_2 because these are the minimum values allowing consortium formation, while on the same time the resulting clustering coefficient is closer to the empirical one.




Figure S11: Model performance for various network properties. Plot of the power-law exponent γ (top), the assortativity coefficient r (middle), and the clustering coefficient cl (bottom), for different probabilities of consortium formation p . Circles represent results of the model variant V_1 , squares results of V_2 , and diamonds results of V_3 . All results are averages over 100 realizations, and the error bars represent the standard errors. The networks used contained 1390 nodes and 1947 links.